

U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Paterson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,529,115) in view of Paine (U.S. Pat. No. 3,603,382). In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections.

All of the claims that stand rejected include a limitation to "a container having a receptacle for receiving an electronic device." The term "receptacle" is expressly defined in the disclosure (p. 11, lines 13-16):

The term "receptacle" as used herein means a surface capable of receiving an electronic device. The receptacle may be part of the container as in FIGS. 2A, 2B, and 2C, or it may be an intermediate heat spreader as in FIGS. 1A and 1B.

Therefore, the receptacle is either part of the container or is an intermediary between the container and electronic device.

Neither Paterson nor Paine, alone or in combination, disclose a container having such a "receptacle" as stated in the claims. Instead, Paterson discloses (FIGS. 1 and 4) a container (14) which is secured at a location adjacent to the electronic device (12) by clips (17). ('115 patent, col. 4, lines 3-6). The Examiner argues that the chip socket (13) constitutes a receptacle for receiving the electronic device (12). However, as shown in FIGS. 1 and 4, the chip socket (13) is on the *opposite* side of the electronic device (12) relative to the container (14). Therefore, the chip socket (13) is not part of the container or an intermediary between the container and electronic device.

Paine, furthermore, also does not teach a "receptacle" as set forth in the claims. Rather, Paine teaches the "cooling of concentrically arranged materials." ('382 patent, col. 2, lines 5-6). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove his rejection of the pending claims under § 103.


Although several other limitations stated in the claims are not disclosed by Paterson or Paine (e.g., "the container being capable of receiving a cooling conduit"

(Claims 1-4, 6), "connecting a cooling conduit to the container" (Claims 10-11), "forcing air or liquid through the cooling conduit" (Claims 10-11), "wherein the liquid coolant does not contact both the inner wall and the outer wall simultaneously" (Claims 16-20), and "flow divider" (Claims 4 and 20)), Applicants feel that the above noted deficiencies of the Paterson and Paine disclosures are adequate to address and rebut the Examiner's § 103 rejection.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, Applicants believe they have overcome each of the rejections. The application is therefore in condition for allowance and early notification of allowance is respectfully requested. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 245-5393 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jeffrey M. Nichols  
Registration No. 46,958

Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200